

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated November 15, 2006, claims 1-20 were presented for examination. Claims 14 and 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Lennon et al.*, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0107973.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the careful and thorough review and action on the merits in this application.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §101

In the Office Action dated November 15, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 14 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §101 indicating the claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter. However, the Examiner did not reject dependent claim 15. As suggested by the Examiner, Applicants have amended claim 14 to include the language of claim 15, and have canceled claim 15. Accordingly, in view of the amendments presented herein, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner remove the rejection of claims 14 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §101.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

In the Office Action dated November 15, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by *Lennon et al.*, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0707973.

Applicants' remarks pertaining to *Lennon et al.* in response to the First Office Action are hereby incorporated by reference.

The *Lennon et al.* patent pertains to browsing collections of metadata to access electronic multimedia content. Applicants' invention focuses on management of a managed object through a single URL assigned to an attribute of the management object. Applicants leverage a single address and select from among three commands to manage the object, as opposed to using a

separate URL for each command. *Lennon et al.* does not disclose a single URL for an attribute of the managed object, and more specifically, the selection of the commands available through the use of a single URL, as claimed by Applicants in the amendment present herewith. The Examiner notes the use of the term “get” by *Lennon et al.* However, *Lennon et al.* does not teach the SET or INVOKE commands as claimed by Applicants. Furthermore, *Lennon et al.* does not teach using a single URL for an attribute of the managed object and then managing the object with the three commands claimed. Accordingly, Applicants’ claimed invention assigns a single URL to an attribute of the managed object and uses interface support commands to efficiently communicate with the managed object.

Reconsideration is requested of the rejection of claims 1-20 as anticipated by *Lennon et al.* *Lennon et al.* does not disclose assigning a single URL to an attribute of the management object together with the interface support commands. Applicants have amended each of the independent claims 1, 8 and 14 to include the limitation associated with management of an object. Support for this amendment is found on page 5, line 24 through page 6, line 16 of the Specification. *Lennon et al.* teaches using a hardware device as a conduit to access a data file in a repository. However, there is no teaching within *Lennon et al.* to manage configuration of it’s hardware device in the manner claimed by Applicants. “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.”¹ Since *Lennon et al.* does not assign a URL to an attribute of the managed object and employ the support commands claimed by Applicants to managed the object, clearly *Lennon et al.* does not anticipate the invention of Applicants based upon the legal definition of anticipation. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner remove the rejection of claims 1-14 and 16-20 and grant an allowance of these claims.

III. Conclusion

Applicants believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly,

¹ MPEP §2131 (citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F. 2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987))

Applicants request that the Examiner indicate allowability of claims 1-14 and 16-20, and that the application pass to issue. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of the application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

For the reasons outlined above, withdrawal of the rejection of record and an allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Rochelle Lieberman /
Rochelle Lieberman
Registration No. 39,276
Attorney for Applicants

Lieberman & Brandsdorfer, LLC
802 Still Creek Lane
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
Phone: (301) 948-7775
Fax: (301) 948-7774
Email: rocky@legalplanner.com

Date: January 16, 2007